

REMARKS

This is in response to the non-final Office Action mailed October 3, 2008. Claims 1 and 11 are amended, example support for the amendments being found in the specification at least on page 8, lines 15-27. Claims 1-3, 6, and 11-13 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance are requested for the following reasons.

1. Rejection of Claims the Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 6

In section 6, the Office Action rejects claims 1-3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,892,512 (“Donnelly”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,008,806 (“Nakajima”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,429,882 (“Abdelnur”) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,262,729 (“Marcos”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a processor being programmed to traverse the hierarchical tree to connect the input sequence to the associated action via the command binding, and, when the command binding is not found, bubble and tunnel the input sequence to a next higher or lower node in the hierarchical tree.

In contrast, Donnelly at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, Donnelly merely discloses a menu definition object 230 is constructed by holding a flat set of menu entries 232. See col. 10, lines 59-61. In Donnelly menu definition instances are embedded within other menu definition instances. See col. 10, lines 65-67. In addition, in Donnelly, a base Menu Definition object 230 is created which contains all the view attributes that are associated with a specified menu definition. See col. 11, lines 1-3. An Action Framework 10 provides a predefined set of view attributes 242 for common Menu Definition types 240 that are stored within the underlying file system 30. See col. 11, lines 4-7. As a result, Donnelly does not disclose traversing a hierarchical tree to connect the input sequence to the associated action. Accordingly, Donnelly merely discloses collective views being created via a tree like structure and an action framework providing predefined view attributes. Donnelly is silent with respect to traversing a hierarchical tree to connect the input sequence to the associated action.

In addition, Nakajima does not overcome Donnelly's deficiencies. Nakajima discloses providing extensions through which application developers may extend the capabilities of a shell of an operating system. See Abstract. Nakajima does not disclose traversing a hierarchical tree to connect the input sequence to the associated action.

Abdelnur does not overcome these deficiencies of Donnelly and Nakajima. Abdelnur discloses searching a properties file to automatically populate binding information for an action bar, menu bar, and tool bar. See col. 13, lines 3-15; Fig. 5. The properties file is simply an ASCII-format file stored in a file system. See col. 11, lines 1-6 and 19-21. Abdelnur fails to disclose traversing a hierarchical tree to connect the input sequence to the associated action.

Marcos does not overcome these deficiencies of Donnelly, Nakajima, and Abdelnur. Marcos discloses that a component can be shared when the component is placed in a location that is known to applications. See col. 7, lines 49-50. Thus, any application can access the component that known location. See col. 7, lines 50-51. Hence, there is no need to copy the component to an application's direction and multiple applications can share the same component. See col. 7, lines 51-53. Marcos fails to disclose traversing a hierarchical tree to connect the input sequence to the associated action.

Consequently, the combination of Donnelly, Nakajima, Abdelnur, and Marcos fails to disclose or suggest traversing a hierarchical tree to connect the input sequence to the associated action. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 are therefore requested.

Claims 2, 3, and 6 depend from claim 1. Claims 2, 3, and 6 are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as those provided herein regarding claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 2, 3 and 6 is requested.

Claims 11 and 12

In section 7, the Office Action rejects claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donnelly in view of Marcos and further in view of Abdelnur. This rejection is respectfully traversed. As discussed herein, the combination of Donnelly, Marcos, and Abdelnur fails to disclose or suggest traversing a hierarchical tree to connect the input sequence to the associated action, as recited by claim 11. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of claim 11 are therefore requested.

Claim 12 depends from claim 11. Claim 12 is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as those provided herein regarding claim 11. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 12 is requested.

Claim 13

In section 8, the Office Action rejects claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donnelly in view of Marcos in view of Abdelnur and further in view of Nakajima. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested for the following reasons. Claim 13 depends from claim 11 and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 11 provided herein regarding claim 11.

II. Conclusion

Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary. In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Additionally, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees as set forth in §§ 38 CFR 1.16 to 1.18 which may be required for entry of these papers or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: February 3, 2009

/Robert A. Kalinsky/
Name: Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No.: 50,471